

REMARKS

Claims 1 - 6 and 12 are currently pending in the application.

Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment is not patentable over the art cited by the Examiner, as claim amendments and cancellations in the present application are directed toward facilitating expeditious prosecution of the application and allowance of the currently-presented claims at an early date. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to pursue claims, including the subject matter encompassed by the claims as presented prior to this Amendment and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.

I. Rejection under 35 U. S. C. §102(b)

Paragraph 3 of the Office Action dated June 23, 2008 (hereinafter, “the Office Action”) states that Claims 1 - 6 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 6,731,393 to Currans et al. (hereinafter, “Currans”). This rejection is respectfully traversed with regard to the remaining claims as currently presented.

The first element of independent Claim 1 recites “enabling a user to identify, from a rendered view of content, a portion of the content which is of interest to the user”. Relative to this subject matter, the Office Action cited column 13, lines 55-57. This passage states that “[n]ote that this document is a user’s personalized newspaper which contains information in

which the user has indicated a specific interest in, as stored in the user profile in knowledge module 170.” There is no teaching or disclosure in this passage of a user, identifying from a rendered view of content, a portion of the content which is of interest to the user. No rendered view of content is taught or disclosed. How the user in Currans indicates a specific interest in the information is not described. Currans simply does not suggest, disclose or teach this subject matter.

The first element of Claim 1 further recites “wherein a renderer of the view of the content has not provided a subscription interface thereto”. Relative to this subject matter, the Office Action cited column 7, lines 23 - 27. This passage states that “[i]t should be noted that although depicted as an element of edit module 120, those skilled in the art will appreciate that content manager 518 may well be deployed as an [sic] separate and independent functional entity”. Edit module 120 as illustrated in Figure 13 includes a virtual editor 506 which includes the content manager 518. Relative to the content manager 518, Currans simply states in column 6, lines 47 - 53 “virtual editor 506 includes a content manager 518 ... [a]s the editor module 120 receives content from one or more content providers, content manager 518 is selectively invoked by controller[s] 502.” Apparently, the Office Action equates the content manager 518 to the subscription interface of Claim 1. The easiest way to describe a ‘subscription interface’ is to say that it is a user interface via which a user subscribes to content. The content manager 518 of Currans apparently has no such function. The content manager 518 includes an analysis agent 522, a contract administrator function 524 and a

transaction agent 526. There is no description in Currans that supports the concept that the content manager 518 includes a user interface of any kind. The content manager 518 manages content that has apparently already been specified or selected. Accordingly, since the content manager does **not** include an interface, and thus does not disclose or teach a subscription interface, whether or not the content manager 518 is deployed as a separate and independent function from the edit module 120 is irrelevant. The content manager 518 includes no interface functionality. Arguendo, whether or not the content manager 518 is part of the edit module 120 or not is also irrelevant. The content manager 518 **is provided somewhere** in the Currans system, just not necessarily as a component of the edit module 120. For these reasons, Applicants submit that Claim 1 further distinguishes over Currans.

As noted in the prior Amendment, Applicants previously amended their claim language herein to recite that the renderer of the content does not provide a subscription interface (“... wherein a renderer of the view of the content has not provided a subscription interface thereto”, Claim 1, lines 4 - 5). Applicants respectfully submit that this is not taught, or suggested, by Currans. Notably, neither the content providers **50** or the advertising providers **80** in Currans are responsible for rendering the content; as noted in the above-cited analysis in the Office Action, these providers provide content to the edit module for rendering.

In view of the above, Claim 1 is deemed patentable over Currans. Dependent Claims 2 - 6 and 12 are therefore deemed patentable by virtue of (at least) the patentability of Claim 1

from which they depend.

The Examiner is therefore respectfully requested to withdraw the §102 rejection of all claims as currently presented.

II. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending rejected claims, withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections, and allowance of all remaining claims at an early date.

Respectfully submitted,

/Marcia L. Doubet/

Marcia L. Doubet
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 40,999

Customer Number for Correspondence: 43168

Phone: 407-343-7586

Fax: 407-343-7587